

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/627,775

Applicant(s)
Greene

Examiner
Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit
1634



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arun Chakrabarti

(3) _____

(2) Samuel Woodley

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 6, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:
None

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant was informed about the allowability of all pending claims.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 1634

DETAILED ACTION
EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CAR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Samuel Woodley on June 6, 2003.

The application has been amended as follows:

Claims 2, 18, 34, 37, 41, and 45 have been amended.

Claim 2 has been amended by deleting the word ---an ----- on line 2 before the phrase ---inhibitor effective to--- and by inserting the phrase --- a TRANCE/RANK---- in between the phrase ---an amount of---- and the phrase ---inhibitor effective to---.

Claim 18 has been amended by deleting the word ---an ----- on line 3 before the phrase ---inhibitor effective to--- and by inserting the phrase --- a TRANCE/RANK---- in between the phrase ---an amount of---- and the phrase ---inhibitor effective to---.

Claim 34 has been amended by deleting the word ---an ----- on line 2 before the phrase ---inhibitor effective to--- and by inserting the phrase --- a TRANCE/RANK---- in between the phrase ---an amount of---- and the phrase ---inhibitor effective to---.

Art Unit: 1634

Claim 37 has been amended by deleting the number ---36 ----- on line 1 after the phrase ---
The method of--- and by inserting the number ---- 34-----.

Claim 41 has been amended by deleting the number ---36 ----- on line 1 after the phrase ---
The method of--- and by inserting the number ---- 34 -----.

Claim 45 has been amended by deleting the number ---36 ----- on line 1 after the phrase ---
The method of--- and by inserting the number ---- 34 -----.

Reasons for Allowance

2. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: In view of the examiner's amendment, the present invention is directed to a method of inhibiting osteoclastogenesis comprising the steps of administering to a patient an amount of a TRANCE/RANK inhibitor effective to inhibit osteoclastogenesis.

Although Yamaguchi et al. (Journal of Biological Chemistry, (1998), Vol. 273 (9), pages 5117-5123) suggests an osteoclastogenesis inhibitory factor (OCIF) that binds to the tumor necrosis factor receptor family, Yamaguchi et al does not teach a method of inhibiting osteoclastogenesis comprising the steps of administering to a patient an amount of a TRANCE/RANK inhibitor effective to inhibit osteoclastogenesis. Moreover, the applicant has disclosed (Nature, 390: 175-179, (1997)) that TRANCE/RANK receptor is basically and structurally different than other receptor(s) of the tumor necrosis factor receptor family.

Art Unit: 1634

In view of the absence of either teaching or suggestion of such a method of inhibiting osteoclastogenesis comprising the steps of administering to a patient an amount of a TRANCE/RANK inhibitor effective to inhibit osteoclastogenesis, the present invention is novel and non-obvious.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti , Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 306-5818. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 746-4979. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (703) 605-1237.

Arun Chakrabarti,


Application/Control Number: 09/627,775

Page 5

Art Unit: 1634

Patent Examiner,

June 9, 2003



GARY BENZION, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600